

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claim 40 has been amended to recite a waveform of the injection rate. An example of the waveform is shown in Fig. 10.

Claims 40-49 were again rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Uber et al in view of Duchon, Cherek et al and Dahlin et al, wherein Duchon, Cherek et al and Dahlin et al were only cited for teachings related to touch screens.

It is Applicant's understanding of the aforementioned rejection that the system of Uber et al automatically performs injection based on the parameters of Table 1, which parameters do not change, and so a predetermined injection time will inherently remain unchanged for each injection of contrast medium into the subject.

Assuming that this, in fact, represents the basis for the rejection, it is respectfully traversed. The duration of injection is not a determined parameter in Table 1. Instead, Table 1 (third entry under "Intra Arterial") simply indicates that the "Input Parameter" of "Procedure/Body Location" will cause the "Effected Parameter" of "Duration of Injection" to vary. That is, the duration of injection will be a variable.

Additionally, the claims now recite that the predetermined injection time is unchanged when making the injection pattern, which is based on a base-operation condition including data of a predetermined injection time for the injection corresponding to the selected region, a necessary dose of effective component of the contrast medium per unit weight of the subject corresponding to the selected region, a concentration of the effective component, and a waveform of an injection rate.

It is respectfully submitted that the parameters of Table 1 do not include determining the injection time, particularly for a selected region. This is instead left undetermined and

can vary from one injection to the next. For example, even for the same patient, it will vary if one of the input parameters, e.g., the patient's weight, varies between injections.

The Office Action has apparently concluded that the system of Uber et al determines the injection time, based on the conclusion that it "calculates everything else necessary to perform the injection and scanning" (Office Action, p. 6). However, even this conclusion does not support the inherency of determining a predetermined an unchanging injection time for a selected region since in, e.g., Fig. 9, the flow rate is constantly being adjusted, leading to different and undetermined injection times.

In any case, Uber et al does not create a base-operation condition including data of a predetermined injection time for the injection corresponding to the selected region, a necessary dose of effective component of the contrast medium per unit weight of the subject corresponding to the selected region, a concentration of the effective component, and a waveform of an injection rate, "wherein the predetermined injection time is unchanged when making the injection pattern." The Office Action has stated that the user or system of Uber et al "can select ... the predetermined injection time to be unchanged and the system will adjust the injection rate based on the user's weight" (p. 3).

Since Duchon, Cherek et al and Dahlin et al were only cited for teachings related to touch screens, it is respectfully submitted that the claims define over this prior art.

Applicants therefore believe that the present application is in a condition for allowance and respectfully solicit an early Notice of Allowability.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
Robert T. Pous
Registration No. 29,099
Attorneys of Record